



Commissioner of Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450
United States of America

By EFS

In Re Application of: Keith James Hensel
US Application Number: 10/575847
Filing Date: 14 April 2006
Title: Citrus Reamer and Press
Group Art Unit:
Examiner:
Attorney Docket No: BRE0326U

1 December 2008

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S FIRST REPORT

Dear Sirs,

The Applicant is in receipt of the examiner's report mailed on 12 November 2008. The examiner's observations are gratefully acknowledged.

As a result of the enclosed amendments it is considered that the application is in condition for allowance and the same is respectfully urged.

The Applicant has abided by the examiner's suggestions regarding the arrangement of the specification and minor amendments including amendment to the section titles are contained in the attached pages of a substitute specification showing same.

Issues relating to 35USC112 have been resolved by amendment. With respect to the Section 112 rejection, the examiner is requested to observe that a “four bar linkage” is a relatively common mechanical engineering structure and the term is well understood to those of ordinary skill in engineering design of products of this kind.

The examiner also objects that all of the claims are “clearly” anticipated by US 7,267,050 (“the 050”). The examiner contends that Juris has primary ribs that “inherently” have two profiles. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although the word “profile” is subject to a number of different interpretations, so is every other word in the English language. Thus, in the context of the claims and the specification the term “profile” clearly relates to the appearance of the ribs in side-view. To say that each rib has two profiles, thus inherently means that each rib has two different profiles or the statement would be meaningless. If it is the examiner’s position that “profiles” includes identical sub-profiles, then every rib could be seen as having an infinite number of profiles, which conclusion is clearly absurd.

Claim 1 now clearly recites that these profiles comprise an upper profile and a lower profile, with a concave transitional section located between them. This structure is specifically and (more than) adequately disclosed by e.g. Figures 6(g) and 6(h) together with the text of the specification accompanying these figures. As recited on page 8 of the specification as filed, lines 9-13, “The dual profile or compound profile reamer may also incorporate a transitional section 250 located between the upper profile 248 and the lower profile 246”. The advantages of this dual profile or compound profile system are clearly revealed with even a cursory review of the specification and drawings as filed. No other reamer is known to have the ability to efficiently handle such a wide range of fruit sizes as that forming the subject matter of claim 1. None of the cited art discloses a dual profile reamer with a concave transitional section between the upper profile and the lower profile.

The examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider the specification, the drawings and the accompanying claims, as currently amended. The Applicant has made good faith efforts to bring the application into condition for allowance and the same is respectfully urged.

Please charge any deficiency in the fees due to our Deposit Account No. 503458 in the name of Molins & Co.

Regards,



Michael Molins

Reg. No. 31785

Customer No. 33372

Encl. Amended Specification
Amended Specification Marked Up
Amended Claims

MM/rm